UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,313	06/02/2006	Tadashi Takenaka	060430	3860
	7590 12/24/200 TOS & HANSON, LL	EXAMINER		
1420 K Street, N.W. Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			KING, BRADLEY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3657	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/581,313	TAKENAKA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Bradley T. King	3657				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
Period for Reply	VIO OFT TO EVENE - MONTH	0) 00 7 400 7 400				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 O</u>	october 2009					
	action is non-final.					
· -						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-9,17 and 18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>10-16,19 and 20</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 June 2006</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	·					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/02/2006</u> .	6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of group II in the reply filed on 10/22/2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-9 and 17-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10/22/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-13 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3657

Claim 11 recites "a ridged portion", "a chamfered surface" and "a corner portion". It is not clear if these portions relate to the portions defined in claim 11, or if they are new portions.

Claims 12-13 and 19-20 recites portions "with sag" and portions with "no sag" or similar limitations. It is not clear what structure corresponds to "sag" and "no sag". It is not clear if this structure is intended to be different than the recited chamfer surfaces.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-13, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (US 2004/0200674) in view of Hendrickson (US 3623579).

Campbell discloses a brake disk including; a recessed and ridged portion which is recessed and protruded in a radial direction is formed repeatedly on an outer peripheral edge of a rotor plate of the brake disk along a circumferential direction. See figure 9. Campbell lacks the explicit disclosure of a chamfered surface provided on a corner portion of the recessed and ridged portion. Hendrickson discloses a similar brake device and further teaches a chamfer portion 33 or 34 to remove sharp edges and prevent damage to pads. Col. 2, lines 29-33. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the chamfers

Art Unit: 3657

taught by Hendrickson in the device of Campbell to increase the safety of handling of the device and prevent damage to the brake pad structure. Regarding the "press molding" recitation, it is noted that the step of press molding does not appear to provide a structural distinction to the chamfer structure. Note MPEP 2114.

Regarding claims 12-13 and 19-20, note the 112 2nd rejection above. Since the recited sag appears to be substantially the same as the chamfer, the chamfers of Campbell and Hendrickson are readable on the recited chamfer and sag portions.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (US 2004/0200674) and Hendrickson (US 3623579) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Torii et al (US 2002/0003071).

Campbell and Hendrickson disclose all the limitations of the instant claims with exception to the explicit disclosure of the dimensions of the chamfers. Torii et al disclose a similar device and further teach chamfer portions of .5mm or less. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the appropriate chamfer sizes for Campbell and Hendrickson, including values of .5mm as taught and evidenced by Torri et al, through routine design and/or experimentation to provide proper safety and disk strength.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Moore and Burgoon et al.

Art Unit: 3657

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley T. King whose telephone number is (571) 272-7117. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:00-7:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Siconolfi can be reached on (571) 272-7124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bradley T King/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3657

BTK